

Appl. No. 09/976,500
Amtd. Dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 23, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P14484/031941-094
EUS/J/P/05-6185

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended Claims 35-37, 40-41, 44-45, 47-48, 50, 52-56, 63-68; Claims 1-34, 38-39, 43, 46, 58-62 have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 35-37, 40-42, 44-45, 47-57 and 63-68 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Examiner Objections - Claims

The Examiner objected to Claims 35, 52, 63 and 66 because of informalities. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims and made appropriate amendments to correct the informalities. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner objected to Claims 35, 58, 63, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant has either cancelled those claims or made further amendments to overcome the Examiner's objections. The Applicant once again extremely appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the pending claims and a favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 35-41, 43-47, 57-59, 61, 63, 65 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gershman et al. (US 6,199,099).

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and has further amended the pending independent claims to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant considers as his invention. The Examiner's

Appl. No. 09/976,500
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 23, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P14484/031941-094
EUS/J/P/05-6185

favorable reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is earnestly requested.

The present invention discloses and claims a system and method for distributing and maintaining end user personal profile data in a data communication system. In accordance with the teachings of the present invention, in order to control access to certain "personal profile data" being maintained by an information providing application, a central protection server further maintains "personal protection profile information" for that particular user. As further recited in the pending claims, the "personal protection profile information" indicates which portion of the personal profile data for a particular user is accessible by a particular application within the data communication system. In other words, the "personal profile data" constitutes specific profiling data a particular user. The "personal protection profile information", on the other hand, is not the same as the "personal profile data", but rather information indicating which portion of that "personal profile data" is actually accessible by a particular application within the network.

Therefore, in response to a requesting application requesting access to certain personal profile data for a particular user, the central protection server instead receives the access request and then determines whether the requesting application should have access to the requested personal profile data. In accordance with the teachings of the present invention, the central protection server makes this determination by evaluating the "personal protection profile information" for that identified user and determines whether to grant or deny the access request. In response to the access grant being granted, the requesting application then requests the desired personal profile data from an appropriate information providing application.

Additionally, as recited by dependent claims 37, 64 and 67, the user identity being used by the requesting application is concealed from the information providing application by the central protection server translating and providing a second user identity that is recognizable by the information providing application. As an illustration, the requesting application may be a personal financial institute (bank) wanting to gain access to certain personal profile data from an information providing application without

Appl. No. 09/976,500
Amtd. Dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 23, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P14484/031941-094
EUS/J/P/05-6185

wanting to disclose the account holder's real name or account number. In that regard, the financial institute may know the user using his tax identification number or his real name. On the other hand, the information providing application may know that same user under a different user identity. The central protection server would then receive the account holder's name and translate that user identity into the second identity that is being used by the information providing application. By translating and concealing the requesting application's user identity from the information providing application, not only does the present invention control and regulate the access rights for that user's personal profile data, but also prevent the identity and other sensitive information from being freely distributed over the data network.

The Applicant therefore submits that Gershman simply fails to disclose or teach each and every element of the presently pending independent claims and fails to anticipate or render obvious the present invention. More specifically, the Gershman reference deals with providing a centralized server for a wireless web device to enable the user to search information and to make purchases via that centralized server. As further disclosed in Gershman, the wireless device prompts a user to input information of interest to the user. This information is transmitted a query to a service routine which then queries the web utilizing a distributed communication network to find price, shipping and availability information from various Web suppliers. This information is then formatted and displayed on the hand-held web device. The user may then use the hand-held device to place an order interactively utilizing a distributed communication network. In that regard, Gershman discloses "mySite!" that provides "a central location where a user can access relevant products and services and accomplish daily tasks with ultimate ease and convenience." (Gershman, Col. 30, lines 1-15).

However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Gershman fails to disclose or teach the "central protection server" having access to "personal protection profile information" as presently claimed. As further claimed and explained above, the personal protection profile information is not the "personal profile data", but rather security information as to which portion of that user's personal profile data is accessible by a particular application within the data network. The requesting application then has

Appl. No. 09/976,500
Arndt, Dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 23, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P14484/031941-094
EUS/J/P/05-6185

to gain access grant from the central protection server for a particular portion of a user's personal profile data before actually gaining access to the desired information from the information providing application.

In that regard, the Applicant submits that the Gershman reference may disclose a "customer profile database" (Gershman, Fig. 10A, 1060, Col. 31, lines 1-25). However, the customer profile database as disclosed in the Gershman reference is limited to storing the same "customer profile data" as disclosed in the present application and that there is no separate centralized database storing or having access to "personal protection profile information" as recited in the presently pending independent claims. Accordingly, Gershman fails to disclose a system wherein the "personal profile data" are stored in one application and the "personal protection profile information" controlling the access to that personal profile data are maintained in a separate central protection server. Furthermore, nothing in Gershman discloses a system or method for concealing the user identity being used by the requesting application towards the information providing application by performing an identity translation as further recited by the dependent claims.

The Examiner's favorable consideration of the amended claims is therefore respectfully requested.

5.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected claims 42, 48-52, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershman in view of Weschler (US 6,757,720). The Weschler reference may indeed mention using "HTML", "XML" and "DTD" in the process of managing a plurality of profile data structures in a distributed computing environment. However, since claims 42, and 48-52 are dependent on independent claim 35 and since Weschler likewise fails to anticipate or render obvious those elements as recited by independent Claim 35, the Applicant respectfully submits that those dependent claims are further in condition for allowance. Claim 52 60 has been cancelled without prejudice and no longer pending in this application.

Appl. No. 09/976,500
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 23, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P14484/031941-094
EUS/J/P/05-6185

The Examiner further rejected claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershman in view of Hoyle (US Pat. No. 6,771,290). Notwithstanding whether Hoyle actually teaches using "HTTP" for communicating over a distributed network, the Applicant submits that Hoyle and Gershman, independently or in combination, still fail to teach each and every element as recited by now pending independent claim 35. Since claim 52 depends on now allowable independent claim 35 and recites additional limitation thereto, the Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 52 is also in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 53-56, 61, 66 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershman in view of Hind et al. (US Pat. No. 6,826,690). Again, without arguing with the Examiner as to whether Hind discloses the recited encryption keys and steps as recited by now pending dependent claims, the Applicant believes that the additional Hind reference cited by the Examiner still fails to anticipate or render obvious the presently pending independent claims. The recited system of providing a centralized protection server for having access to "personal protection profile information" for controlling access to certain "personal profile data" being stored at a separate information providing application is neither disclosed nor taught by Gershman and Hind.

As a result, all pending independent claims and their respective dependent claims are allowable over the cited references and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly requested.

Appl. No. 09/976,500
Amtd. Dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 23, 2005
Attorney Docket No. P14484/031941-094
EUS/J/P/05-6185

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,


By John C. Han
Registration No. 41,403

Date: October 14, 2005

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-7686
john.han@ericsson.com